

University of Michigan Law School

## University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository

---

UMLS Alumni Survey Class Reports

University of Michigan Law School Alumni  
Survey Project

---

### Class of 1959 Fifteen Year Report

University of Michigan Law School

Follow this and additional works at: [https://repository.law.umich.edu/alumni\\_survey\\_reports](https://repository.law.umich.edu/alumni_survey_reports)



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#), and the [Legal Profession Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

University of Michigan Law School, "Class of 1959 Fifteen Year Report" (1974).

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Michigan Law School Alumni Survey Project at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in UMLS Alumni Survey Class Reports by an authorized administrator of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [mlaw.repository@umich.edu](mailto:mlaw.repository@umich.edu).

LAW SCHOOL ALUMNI SURVEY  
Class of 1959

## I. INTRODUCTION

For nine consecutive years the University of Michigan Law School has conducted a survey of its graduates in their fifteenth year after graduation. That there is an interest in such a survey on the part of graduates is indicated by the percentages of response: 81% of the Class of 1951, 78% of the Class of 1952, 77% of the Class of 1953, 77% of the Class of 1954, 80% of the Class of 1955, 80% of the Class of 1956, 73% of the Class of 1957, 79% of the Class of 1958, and 79% of the Class of 1959. The questionnaire has been kept virtually the same for each class to facilitate accumulation and comparison of data.

## II. THE FRESHMAN CLASS OF 1956

Residence: Ninety-eight (38%) of the 261 members of the graduating class of 1959 were Michigan residents; 29 came from Ohio; 28 from Illinois; 20 from New York State; 15 from Pennsylvania; 8 from Missouri; 7 from Indiana; 6 from New Jersey; and 5 from Wisconsin. The remainder listed 24 other states, the District of Columbia, Burma, and Canada.

Two hundred and six questionnaires were returned in time for the analysis. Judging from the responses, approximately 24% of the class had foreign-born parents and 54% had foreign-born grandparents. Six members who returned questionnaires were born outside the United States.

Academic Background: The class entered law school from 91 different undergraduate schools. Schools from all sections of the country were represented with heaviest representation from the Midwest and the East. As would be expected the University of Michigan supplied the largest number in the class. If the respondent group is used as the basis for judgment, less than one-third of the students (31% of the respondents) came from undergraduate schools of 20,000 or more. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents came from schools whose size ranged from 1,000 to 5,000, 16% attended schools of between 10,000 to 20,000, 14% schools of under 1,000, and the remaining 10% attended schools between 5,000 to 10,000. Ninety-eight percent (257) of the 261 graduates in the Class of 1959 entered law school with a college degree. The remaining 2% (4) entered on a combined curriculum basis. One hundred and twelve (54%) of the 206 respondents had received some form of undergraduate honors, such as membership in honorary fraternities and societies, scholarships, prizes, and degrees awarded with distinction.

Age: The age range of the class at entrance to law school was 19 through 29 with the average age 23. The median was 22. Eighty-two members of the 261 graduates had some experience with the Armed Services before entering law school. Forty-three have spent at least six months in the Armed Services since graduation.

Education of Parents: The following table indicates the educational level of the parents of the 206 respondents.

Table I  
Educational Attainments of Father and Mother

	MOTHER						TOTAL
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
F A T H E R	A	25		14	4	3	46
	B		1	2			3
	C	4	1	23	3	1	32
	D	4		6	10	7	29
	E	3	1	11	9	20	47
	F			3	11	25	48
	TOTAL	36	3	59	37	56	205*

\* 1 no answer

Key: A - Less than high school D - 1 year or more college, but  
B - Trade School no degree  
C - High School diploma E - 4 years of college with degree  
F - More than one college degree

Thirty-four parents and 21 grandparents were lawyers or had had some legal training.

Extracurricular Activities: Judging from the respondents, many members of the class had taken part in extracurricular activities prior to entering law school. The heaviest participation took place in high school where varsity athletics drew the most participants. Social or service organizations were second and school or community politics was third, with school paper or magazine staff, and dramatics almost equal in numbers of participants as fourth and fifth respectively. Participation in the more highly organized activities such as varsity athletics, work on a school publication, and dramatic presentations fell off markedly after high school. The emphasis in college was directed toward social and service organizations and school or community politics.

### III. THE YEARS 1956-1959

Marital Status and Children: Forty-six of the respondents were married when they began studying law. Sixty-one more married at sometime during the law school years. Eighty-four have married since graduation, the

majority within the first five years after graduation. At the present time 187 of the respondents are married; 12 have never married; and 6 indicate that their marriages have ended with divorce, separation or death. Fourteen of the 187 have married more than once. At the time of graduation the respondents had a total of 76 children; now the total number is 560.

Financial Support: The principal source of income and support during the law school years for most of the respondents was from parents or other members of the immediate family (spouse included). The next most important was the G.I. Bill or other veterans' benefits, with earnings during law school years, including summer earnings, of almost equal importance.

Table II indicates how many of the respondents were employed in each regular academic year while in law school.

Table II  
Number of Respondents Distributed by Year of Law School and  
by Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week During School Terms

		LAW SCHOOL YEAR		
		First	Second	Third
H O U R S  P E R  W E E K	None	124	75	77
	Less than 10	28	35	27
	10-15	27	53	49
	16-20	15	25	24
	More than 20	10	16	25
	No answer	2	2	4
	Total	206	206	206

In response to the Question, "What percentage of your work while in law school, including summer employment, would you consider 'law related?'" 115 said none; 33 said 25% or less; 17, 26% to 51%; 14, 51% to 75%; and 21 answered 75% or more.

Grades: Scores for the Law School Admissions Test (LSAT) were available for all 261 graduates. The high score was 746; the low was 356. The arithmetical mean or average for the 261 was 552; the median was 553. This is a better score than that scored by approximately 75% of all persons then taking the test. For comparison, the average for the class entering in the fall of 1973 was 695, an LSAT score which is better than scores of approximately 97% of those currently being tested.

At the end of three years, most class members had maintained a law school grade average between 2.0 and 3.0. Forty-three had averages of 3.0 or better, and 15 had averages below 2.0. The average for the 261 was 2.56; the median was 2.49. Twenty-one percent had cumulative averages of 2.86 or above; 13% had averages below 2.1. The correlation of LSAT scores to law school grade averages is shown in the following table.

Table III  
Correlation Between LSAT and Grade-Point Average

		Three-Year Cumulative Grade-Point Average							
		3.9-3.0		2.9-2.0		1.9-1.0		Total	
L S A T	700-799	3	37%	5	63%			8	100%
	600-699	19	37%	32	63%			51	100%
	500-599	20	14%	113	78%	12	8%	145	100%
	400-499	1	2%	48	92%	3	6%	52	100%
	300-399			5	100%			5	100%
	Total	43	16%	203	78%	15	6%	261	100%

#### IV. THE YEARS 1959-1974

Residence: Of the 206 respondents 203 are presently located in 29 states and the District of Columbia. One of the remaining 3 is with the Fleet Judge Advocate Division and gave his address as "afloat," one is in the Philippines and one in France. Table IV indicates the movement of the 206 from what was considered the home state at the time of admission to their present location.

Table IV

State	Number from State in 1956	Number Presently Located in State	Net Change
Arizona	1	2	+1
California	1	11	+10
Colorado	1	3	+2
Connecticut	1	5	+4
Delaware	1	1	0
Florida	1	4	+3
Georgia	2	0	-2
Hawaii	2	2	0
Illinois	23	16	-7
Indiana	5	6	+1
Iowa	1	1	0
Kansas	1	0	-1
Kentucky	1	1	0
Massachusetts	2	1	-1
Michigan	76	52	-24
Minnesota	2	5	+3

Table IV cont'd

State	Number from State in 1956	Number Presently Located in State	Net Change
Missouri	6	5	-1
New Hampshire	4	3	-1
New Jersey	4	4	0
New York	11	19	+8
North Dakota	2	1	-1
Ohio	24	25	+1
Oklahoma	1	0	-1
Oregon	1	2	+1
Pennsylvania	12	10	-2
Rhode Island	2	1	-1
South Dakota	1	0	-1
Tennessee	0	1	+1
Texas	1	1	0
Utah	1	1	0
Virginia	1	1	0
Washington	0	1	+1
West Virginia	1	0	-1
Wisconsin	3	3	0
District of Columbia	1	8	+7
*****		***	
Serving in foreign countries or Fleet J. Advocate Division		3	

Those listed in the column "Number Presently Located in State" are listed by the state in which they have their office. Occasionally the office and residence are in different states.

One hundred and twenty respondents are now located in what was considered their home state during attendance in law school; 66 in what was considered their hometown prior to law school; and 80 are located in either the city or state in which they took their undergraduate training.

Size of Communities: Table V organizes the respondents in terms of the size of the communities in which they work; it also compares figures for all lawyers throughout the country.

Table V

Size of Community	Class of '59		All Lawyers in U.S.*		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Under 25M	21	10%	132,868	37%	26%
25M to 100M	32	16%			
100M to 200M	22	11%	100M to 250M	39,162	11%
200M to 500M	22	11%	250M to 500M	41,075	12%
500M to 1M	33	16%	142,137	40%	52%
Over 1M	74	36%			
Total	204**	100%	355,242	100%	

\*The 1971 Lawyer Statistical Report, American Bar Foundation, 1972

\*\* 2 no answer as to size of city of present location

Table VI shows the correlation between the sizes of "hometowns" and present location of class members.

Table VI

Size of City of Present Location	Size of City of Origin						Total
	Under 25M	25M to 100M	100M to 200M	200M to 500M	500M to 1M	Over 1M	
Under 25M	13	4	1	1	1	1	21
25M to 100M	16	8	2	1	3	2	32
100M to 200M	7	3	5			7	22
200M to 500M	9	3	1	7		2	22
500M to 1M	6	5	2	4	8	8	33
Over 1M	19	12	1	6	2	34	74
Total	70	35	12	19	14	54	204*

\* 2 no answer

Table VII shows the correlation between size of community and the various occupations of the members of the Class of '59.

Table VII  
Correlation Between Size of City of Present Location  
& Occupation

Size of City Where Working	Occupation						TOTAL
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
Under 25,000	18			1		2	21
25,000 to 100,000	20	8	2			2	32
100,000 to 200,000	14	4	1			3	22
200,000 to 500,000	15	4				3	22
500,000 to 1,000,000	23	8	1			1	33
Over 1,000,000	42	19	1			11	73
TOTAL	132	43	5	1		22	203*

\* 1 no answer as to occupation & 2 no answer as to size of city

Key: A - Lawyers in private practice or in a law firm  
B - Lawyers, salaried other than law firms (excluding judges, teachers and legislators)  
C - Educators  
D - Judge  
E - Legislator  
F - Non-lawyer

Further information about members in these categories was obtained through the questionnaire. Of the 44 lawyers in Category B (salaried, other than judges, teachers or legislators) 11 are employed by federal, state or local government; 28 are employed by organizations for profit; and 5 checked "other." Four in Category C (educator) are with law schools as professors of law. The remaining person in this category is teaching law on the college level. The judge is an elected judge in a state or local court.

The questionnaire also requested information on the kinds of work performed by those in Categories B and F (see above). Of salaried employees (either lawyer or non-lawyer, working in an organization other than a law firm and excluding judges, teachers and legislators) 37 are legal staff in corporate or governmental organizations. The remainder have diverse occupations which include chairman of the board; general manager; industrial relations or personnel; insurance manager, corporate; international trade; president or vice president of business or corporation; tax specialist; foreign service officer; armed services; Roman Catholic priest; land development; civil servant in international



organization; editorial staff of legal publishing company; executive director of a legal services program; appellate court commissioner; and homemaker.

Of the 37 who checked "legal staff, corporate or government," 17 are general counsel; 2 trial or hearing specialists; 2 international counsel; 2 patent counsel; 1 title counsel; 3 tax counsel; and 1 legislation counsel. The remaining 8 checked "other" which includes JAG USN; reporting Court of Appeals decisions; procurement and general legal counsel; assistant general counsel, reseacher; and associate counsel.

Thirty-nine of the respondents are with organizations which have over 1000 employees, 12 with 101-1000, 2 with 51-100, 8 with 10-50, and 5 with under 10. Forty-one respondents supervise from 1-10 employees; 11 supervise 11-50; and 8 supervise over 50.

Combining Categories A and B (i.e., all those working as lawyers whether employed or in private practice, a total of 176) the questionnaire asked for the number of other lawyers in the respondent's office or department. Table VIII gives the results.

Table VIII  
Respondents Distributed According to Number of  
Other Lawyers in Office or Department

Other Lawyers	0	1-3	4-7	8-15	16-30	31-50	Over 51	No ans.
Respondents	13	42	30	19	20	16	23	13

According to The 1971 Lawyer Statistical Report, American Bar Foundation, 1972; a 1968 publication entitled WHERE published by Lawyer Placement Information Services, ABA; as well as a 1966 report by the ABA Committee on Economics of Law Practice, the number of individual practitioners has been steadily decreasing since 1948, while the number of partnerships and associates has been increasing. The Class of '59 seems to reflect this trend. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents in private practice are in partnerships or professional corporations. The 1971 Statistical Report also notes an increase in the percentage of lawyers employed by private industry, educational institutions, and other private employment. Thirty-five percent (72) of the 1959 respondents are thus employed.

Table IX  
Lawyers in Private Practice#

Class of 1959				
	Number	% of Those in Private Practice	% of All 1959 Re- spondents	% of All Lawyers in Practice ('71)*
Sole practitioner	15	11% 16%	7% 10%	36.6%
Sole practitioner in non-partnership	6	5%	3%	
Member of a partner- ship	104	79%	51%	28.5%
Employee of a partnership	6	5%	3%	(Associate) 7.6%
Respondents not in private practice	(74)**		(36%)	

\*The 1971 Lawyer Statistical Report, American Bar Foundation, 1972

\*\*Includes 1 who did not indicate occupation as well as the judge

# One lawyer in private practice or law firm did not check his category

A demographic survey of its readers conducted by the ABA Journal and reported in the December 1970, Volume 56 issue, indicated that 19.8% of those replying were sole practitioners and 52.9% of those replying were partners or associates in a firm. This percentage was based on 552 replies.

Forty-one of the 132 practitioners, Category A (see Table VII) have been in private practice for approximately 15 years. Seventy-nine more have been in private practice for 10 through 14 years. Eighty-four of those in partnership started in established firms; 12 joined another lawyer then in solo practice and formed a firm; and 8 started by themselves and have added others. Seventy-four of the 104 respondents who are members of a law partnership or corporation report that their firm has a written agreement.

The ABA Economic Facts About Practice, 1966 mentioned earlier states that the average lawyer is compensated for only 5 1/2 hours of an eight-hour day. It also states that about one-third of a lawyer's professional time is devoted to unpaid legal work, education, office management and public service. The questionnaire asked that the respondents indicate the approximate division of their time (average hours per week) during the most recent 12 months among the following categories: chargeable time for clients, non-chargeable time for clients, and career-oriented work. While not all of the 132 practicing lawyers answered this, the responses would indicate they manage more chargeable hours than the 5 1/2 per day given in the ABA report. Table X indicates the way the class's practicing lawyers divided their time during the most recent 12 months.

Table X  
Division of Time for Practicing Lawyers in the  
Class of '59

	Average Hours Per Week						No ans.
	Under 10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	Over 50	
Chargeable time		2 (2%)	26 (20%)	52 (39%)	23 (17%)	24 (18%)	5 (4%)
Non-chargeable time	84 (64%)	27 (20%)	1 (1%)		2 (2%)		18 (13%)
Career-oriented work	85 (64%)	29 (22%)	2 (2%)		3 (2%)		13 (10%)

The hours spent by each respondent in all three categories were totaled with the following results. Forty-one (31%) of the practicing lawyers spend 40 to 50 hours per week in professional effort of one kind or another; 36 (27%) spend about 55 hours; 34 (26%) spend 60 or over. Sixteen (12%) spend up through 35 hours per week. The remaining 4% did not answer this question.

Specialties: Those members of the class working as lawyers whether in practice, for government, or for a corporation, were asked to indicate their specialty, or specialties, if they had any. "Specialty" was defined as an area of law in which one spends more than 25% of his working time. Members were asked to limit themselves to three responses. Classifying occupations by subject matter has only limited value in revealing a lawyer's true function. But lawyers are accustomed to identifying themselves in these terms and thus should have a fair notion of the meaning of a classification of the sort listed below. Table XI lists specialties in order of frequency of response.

Table XI

<u>Subject Area</u>	<u>Number of Specialists</u>
Trial, General	39
Corporation & Business Counseling	37
Real Property	31
Trust & Probate	23
Trial, Negligence	20
Securities Issuance & Regulation	20
Taxation	17
Antitrust	17
No area accounts for 25% of time	16
Banking & Commercial Law	15
Other	11
Domestic Relations	10
Patent, Trademark & Copyright	8
Criminal Law	7
Negligence	7
International Law	7
	-

Table XI cont'd

<u>Subject Area</u>	<u>Number of Specialists</u>
Administrative Law	6
Insurance	4
Municipal	4
Legislation	4
Labor Law	3
Government Contracts	3
Bankruptcy - Collections	2
Public Utility Regulation	2
Admiralty	2
Employee Benefits	2
Oil, Gas & Mineral	2
Aviation	0

The respondents were also asked to check membership certificates, some of which suggest specialized practice of interests. Only 4 spaces on the coding sheet were allowed for this and some respondents belong to more than four.

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>
Local Bar Association	161
State Bar Association	145
Federal Bar Association	22
American Bar Association	134
Patent Bar	7
American Trial Lawyers' Association	18
American College of Trial Lawyers	0
International Assoc. of Insurance Counsel	2
CPA	5
CLU	0
Real Estate License	1
Other	19

One hundred and forty-one respondents are admitted to practice before one state court, 44 in two states and 12 in three or more.

Career Objective: Ninety of the 206 respondents entered law school with a particular career objective in mind, and 77 of these had the same career objective in mind at graduation time. Sixty-two others left law school with a career objective. Presumably 13 of these 62 changed their career objective sometime after their freshman year, and the remaining 49 acquired an objective while attending law school. One hundred and sixteen of those who had a career objective at graduation are presently achieving it, and most feel it was a sound choice; of

these 116, 65 are among the high earners (\$40,000 or more average yearly income, excluding taxes and investment). Ninety of the 116 are practicing lawyers or members of a law firm.

Stability: Judging from the respondents, the Class of '59 gives evidence of occupational stability. One hundred and twenty-seven of the 206 have held positions with no more than two firms or organizations, while 34 more have been connected with only 3. Ninety-five (46%) have been with their present firm or organization for more than 10 years; 6 for 10 years; 8 for 9; 9 for 8; 14 for 7; 12 for 6; 11 for 5; 12 for 4; 5 for 3; 12 for 2; and 13 for 1. Forty-three have had their careers interrupted by military service; 9 by travel and study abroad; and 11 have done graduate study in law, business, accounting or other fields, full time, for periods of six months or more.

One hundred and four of the 132 practitioners have been in practice for 12 years or more. Sixty-six of these have had their own office or have been with the same firm for the same length of time. Only 12 of the remaining 38 have been with more than 3 firms since leaving law school. Twenty-one of the 132 practitioners are in practice by themselves, either as sole practitioners or sole practitioners in non-partnership association with other lawyers. One hundred and four are members of a partnership or professional corporation. Six are employees of a partnership or professional corporation. One practitioner did not indicate category.

Both lawyers and non-lawyers were asked to indicate in chronological order the kinds of positions they have held since graduation. There was opportunity to indicate 6. Not counting military service (except for career officers) the first position held by 121 of the respondents was as an employee of a law firm. Eighteen were employed as lawyers for corporations. Twelve accepted positions with state or federal government (excluding judicial clerkships). Two took positions with city or county government. Nine accepted judicial clerkships. Nine started their careers practicing by themselves. Five became partners in a law firm. Eight began as corporate employees (non-law). Two went into business for themselves (non-law). Three entered the armed forces; and 16 took positions suggested by the following descriptions: instructor, law school; U. of M. P. & R. Program; federal executive; clerkship with a lawyer; CPA (tax); law professor; editor in legal publishing Co.; advertising claims adjuster, staff; business school; and teacher.

Thirteen respondents have held one position since graduation; 72 have held 2; 65, 3; 29, 4; 17, 5; and 9 have held 6 or more positions.

Income: Members were asked to indicate their average income (before taxes, excluding income from investments) during four separate periods since graduation; the first three years; the second three years; the

next four years; and the most recent four years. Table XII reveals the growth of income over the 15 years since graduation. During the first three years out of law school 60% of 200\* members earned less than \$7,500 and only 2% earned over \$12,500. During the last four years 99% of the 200 answering this section earned \$12,500 or over.

\*6 did not answer income in either the first 3 years or for the most recent four years.

Table XII  
Average Annual Income  
(Before Taxes and Excluding Investments) Since Graduation

Years Since Graduation From Law School

Range	First 3		Next 3 (4 thru 6)		Next 4 (7 thru 10)		Most Recent 4	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Below \$3,000	3	1%	Below 7500 9	5%	Below \$12,500 10	5%	Below \$20,000 8	4%
\$3,000-4,999	18	9%						
\$5,000-7,499	98	48%						
\$7,500-9,999	64	31%						
\$10,000-12,499	12	6%						
\$12,500-14,999	\$12,500 and Over 5	2%	61	30%	13	6%	Below \$30,000 and Over 31	15%
\$15,000-17,499			\$15,000 and Over 33	16%	30	15%		
\$17,500-19,999					30	15%		
\$20,000-24,999					47	23%	22	11%
\$25,000-29,999					38	18%	34	16%
\$30,000-34,999					\$30,000 and Over 31	15%	22	10%
\$35,000-39,999							24	12%
\$40,000-49,999							39	19%
\$50,000-59,999							16	8%
\$60,000-75,000							18	9%
Above \$75,000							17	8%
No answer	6	3%	7	3%	7	3%	6	3%
Total	206	100%	206	100%	206	100%	206	100%

In the demographic study entitled "In Search of the Average Lawyer," which was referred to on page 9 of this report, the average annual income reported by respondents was \$27,960; the median was \$21,260. It must be remembered that this study was published in 1970, but even so it appears Michigan graduates are not typical when it comes to income.

Table XIII compares the average income of practicing lawyers for the most recent four years with those in all other categories listed in the questionnaire.

Table XIII  
Practitioner Compared With All Other Categories  
Income - Most Recent Four Years  
(Before Taxes and Excluding Investments)

Income Range	Practitioners		All Others	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Below \$25,000	11	9%	19	27%
\$25,000-29,999	17	13%	17	24%
\$30,000-34,999	12	9%	10	14%
\$35,000-39,999	13	10%	11	15%
\$40,000-49,999	32	25%	7	10%
\$50,000-59,999	14	11%	2	3%
\$60,000-75,000	16	12%	2	3%
Over \$75,000	14	11%	3	4%
No answer	3		3	
Total	132	100%*	74	100%**

\*Based on 129

\*\*Based on 71

## V. HIGH EARNERS

Ninety of the 206 respondents indicated that their average income for the most recent four years was \$40,000 or more. These have been designated "high earners." The amount of money one earns is not the only or possibly even the best measure of success, but certainly it is one of the most common. What follows is an analysis of the high earners which parallels that of the entire class. An analysis of the characteristics of this group should indicate whether factors which employers regard as important actually bear any relationship to financial success.



Age, Marital Status and Children: The average age of the high earners when they entered law school was 23, the median was 22 - the same as that of the entire 261 graduates. Twenty-one were married at the time they entered law school. Thirty married at sometime during their three years in law school. By graduation these 51 had had 27 of the total of 76 children for the respondents. Currently 84 of the high earners are married and account for 258 children of the 560 total for the 206 respondents. Seven of the high earners have married more than once, and 4 have never married. Two high earners indicated their marriage ended in divorce, separation or death of spouse.

Table XIV compares the marital status of the high earners with that of the remaining 116.

Table XIV

High Earners (90)			Remaining (116)	
23%	(21)	Married at time of entrance	22%	(25)
33%	(30)	Married while in law school	27%	(31)
93%	(84)	Now married	89%	(103)
4%	(4)	Never married	7%	(8)
2%	(2)	Divorced, separated or spouse deceased	3%	(4)
8%	(7)	More than one marriage	6%	(7)

Financial Support: The principal sources of support listed by the high earners are very similar to those for the entire 206. The order was parents' and family support, first; earnings during law school years, including summer earnings, second; with savings from pre-law school earnings, third. Table XV compares the average number of hours worked per week by the high earners with the average for the remaining respondents in each of the three years in law school.

Table XV  
Average Hours Employed While in Law School

Hours Per Week	First Year		Second Year		Third Year	
	High Earners	All Others	High Earners	All Others	High Earners	All Others
None	56%	64%	30%	41%	28%	45%
Less than 10	19%	9%	22%	13%	20%	8%
10-15	14%	12%	29%	23%	28%	20%
16-20	8%	7%	10%	14%	9%	14%
More than 20	3%	6%	8%	8%	12%	12%
No answer	0%	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The arithmetical mean (average) LSAT for the 90 high earners was 550. The median was 542. The mean for the remaining 116 respondents

was 556, and the median was 559. The grade point averages of the two groups were 2.65 for the high earners and 2.53 for the remaining 116. The medians were 2.61 and 2.42 respectively. Twenty percent of the high earners had grade point averages in the 3.0 and up range against 16% of the remaining 116. Three percent of the high earners had averages in the 1.0 to 2.0 range compared with 5% of the other 116. Fifty-eight percent (52) of the high earners had received scholastic honors of some sort while enrolled in undergraduate school, while 52% (60) of the remaining respondents had received such honors.

Size of Community: Table XVI shows the distribution among cities of various sizes in which the 90 were raised and the cities in which they now work compared with the remaining respondents.

Table XVI  
Comparison of Population of City Where Respondents Were  
Raised and That in Which They Currently Work

Size of City	90 High Earners				116 Others			
	Raised In No.	%	Work In No.	%	Raised In No.	%	Work In No.	%
Under 25,000	27	30%	6	7%	43	37%	15	13%
25,000 to 100,000	16	18%	12	13%	20	17%	20	18%
100,000 to 200,000	7	8%	8	9%	5	4%	14	12%
200,000 to 500,000	9	10%	12	13%	10	9%	10	9%
500,000 to 1,000,000	7	8%	16	18%	7	6%	17	14%
Over 1,000,000	24	26%	36	40%	31	27%	38	34%
Total	90	100%	90	100%	116	100%	114*	100%

\*2 no answer to where they work.

Among both the high earners and the remaining 116 the tendency seems to be to work in large metropolitan areas. Seventy-one percent of the high earners work in cities of 200,000 or more and 57% of the remaining 114 work in cities of comparable size. Forty-four percent of the high earners were raised in cities of this size, and 42% of the remaining 116 were brought up in such communities.

Occupations: Seventy-six high earners are in private practice or law firms; 7 are salaried employees working as lawyers. The remaining 7 high earners are in non-law occupations; 3 are sole or co-proprietors (own more than 30% interest); 2 are employees - supervisory (non-government); 1 is a partner in a CPA firm and the other is vice president in a government

relations firm. Sixty-seven high earners have been with no more than 2 firms or organizations since graduation. This is 74% of the high earners. Sixty (52%) of the remaining respondents have been with no more than 2 firms or organizations. Ten (11%) additional high earners have been with no more than 3 compared with 24 (21%) of the remaining 116. Fifty-five (61%) have been with their present firm or organization for more than 10 years as compared with 40 (34%) of the other 116 respondents. Sixty-nine of the 76 high earners in private practice are members of a partnership or professional corporation, 4 are sole practitioners, 2 are sole practitioners in nonpartnership association with other lawyers, and 1 is an employee of a partnership or professional corporation. Sixty-four of the 76 have been in private practice for 12 years or longer.

Specialties: Of the 29 categories listed in the questionnaire only 4 were not checked by at least one high earner. These were aviation; employee benefits; government contracts; and oil, gas and mineral. Table XVII tabulates the numbers and percentages of high earners in 12 categories and compares them with similar figures for the remaining practitioners. Each of the 12 categories was checked by at least 10 respondents working as lawyers (see Table XI). The respondents were invited to check as many as three specialties.

Table XVII

<u>Specialties</u>	High Earners		Remaining Practitioners	
	No.	%*	No.	%**
Corporation & Business Counseling	32	39%	5	5%
Real Property	13	16%	18	19%
Trial, General	21	25%	18	19%
Trust & Probate	10	12%	13	14%
Taxation	9	11%	8	9%
Trial, Negligence	13	16%	7	8%
No area accounts for more than 25% of time	3	5%	13	14%
Banking & Commercial Law	7	8%	8	9%
Other	5	6%	6	7%
Antitrust	9	11%	8	9%
Securities Issuance & Regulation	13	16%	7	8%
Domestic Relations	3	5%	7	8%

\*Percents based on 83 (number of high earners who are working as lawyers in private practice, a law firm, or as salaried lawyers in other than a law firm, excluding judges, teachers, and legislators)

\*\*Percents based on 93 arrived at in same manner as that of high earners.

Sixty-two (82%) of the 76 high earners who are lawyers in private practice or with a law firm log anywhere from 35 to over 60 hours per

week of chargeable time. Thirty-seven (66%) of the 56 others in this category register so much income-producing time. Eighty-two percent of the high earners in this category spend from 5 to over 20 hours in non-chargeable time for clients. Ninety-three percent of the remaining 56 lawyers in private practice indicated a similar amount of hours in non-chargeable time. Ninety-one percent of the 76 high earners spend 5 to over 20 hours per week in career-oriented work other than for clients. Forty-nine (88%) of the remaining practitioners spend an equal amount of time in career development.

When the entire 90 high earners are considered, it is found that 52, or 58%, have participated in formalized courses in law or other fields since graduation. Twenty-six have held appointive or elective office; 57 have been active in civic affairs. Table XVIII compares these activities of the high earners with those of the rest of the respondents.

Table XVIII

	High Earners	Others
Post-law Education	58% (52)	59% (69)
Appointive or Elective Offices	29% (26)	32% (37)
Civic Activities	63% (57)	58% (67)

## VI. THE LAW SCHOOL PROGRAM

The class was asked to indicate whether course offerings in the following subjects should be increased or decreased. The suggested increases outweigh the suggested decreases.

Table XX  
Suggested Increases

<u>Subjects</u>	<u>First Choice</u>	<u>Second Choice</u>	<u>Third Choice</u>
Commercial Law (including Corp.)	31	17	11
Contracts & Remedies	2	4	4
Criminal Law	2	4	4
Domestic Relations	0	5	3
Estate Planning	11	12	9
Jurisprudence (including legal history)	8	4	7
Labor Law	0	2	3
Legal Writing	24	30	14
Non-law courses in gov., finance, philosophy, or other courses of possible relevance to lawyers	9	12	14
Professional Responsibility	22	14	25

<u>Specialties cont'd</u>	<u>First Choice</u>	<u>Second Choice</u>	<u>Third Choice</u>
Public or Private International Law	5	3	3
Procedure, Evidence & Trial Practice	39	19	11
Real Property (including oil & gas)	2	3	6
Taxation	4	14	16
Torts & Personal Injury	2	0	1
Administrative Law	4	7	10
Municipal Law	1	3	3
Constitutional Law (including Civil Rights)	2	10	3
Other	17	12	8

Suggest Decreases

Commercial Law (including Corp.)	4	4	0
Contracts & Remedies	4	6	6
Criminal Law	6	1	4
Domestic Relations	11	7	7
Estate Planning	5	3	3
Jurisprudence (including legal history)	15	10	5
Labor Law	1	2	5
Legal Writing	3	4	3
Non-law courses in gov., finance, phil- osophy, or other courses of possible relevance to lawyers	27	12	6
Professional Responsibility	2	5	2
Public or Private International Law	15	12	10
Procedure, Evidence & Trial Practice	3	6	1
Real Property (including oil & gas)	2	7	2
Taxation	1	1	1
Torts & Personal Injury	6	3	2
Administrative Law	2	2	5
Municipal Law	3	6	5
Constitutional Law (including Civil Rights)	5	0	5
Other	0	1	0

Under a section called Postgraduate Information the question was asked, "What of your law school training is contributing most meaningfully to your present job ability?" There was also a space provided for Comments in the questionnaire. Many respondents took advantage of these opportunities to express themselves concerning their law school experience both favorably and unfavorably.

In answering the specific question mentioned in the above paragraph some named particular courses. The most frequently named courses were those of the first year, but other courses often mentioned were trusts and estates, estate planning, evidence, taxation, and

corporate law. Others mentioned Case Clubs, research seminars; and LAW REVIEW. Some did not mention specific courses or activities but felt the most value had come from: basic training in legal reasoning; learning to analyze problems; the Socratic method of teaching; ability to communicate; the association with certain teachers; long hours of work; habits of thoroughness acquired; utilization of available time; the pressure of examinations requiring scoping of the problem and haste in its solution; practice court; the development of a healthy skepticism; the high quality of both faculty and students; and an extremely solid foundation. Most respondents were pleased with the training they had received at the University of Michigan Law School stating that its graduates measure well against graduates of other leading law schools.

However, not all respondents were enthusiastic about the law school's contribution to their present situation. A few felt it had contributed very little to their present situation. One credited his undergraduate debate experience as being most valuable and felt that law school was very impractical although the education was sound. Another said most courses taught or required in the late 50's have little relevance to a small town general practice. One respondent named his degree as the most important contribution to his present success.

Many respondents wrote something in the space provided under Comments. Below are some quotations and excerpts which were made.

\*\*\*\*\*

"What I missed in my law school education was contact with what the experiences of the practice of law would be after graduation. Consequently, I would recommend revision of the curriculum by adding courses or clinics to provide such experiences. Such courses could include legal clinics or workshops to provide free legal services to the poor; work in the local government of District Attorney offices; a course on the economics of law office management."

"The University of Michigan Law School was one of the best things that ever happened to me."

"A course in law office management would be worthwhile."

"I would be proud to have any of my children attend the University Law School. However, I really never could understand the philosophy of flunking out 1/3 to 1/2 of the freshmen students. I felt the freshman year was degrading on many students and in part harmful to their future careers. The so-called 'axe' theory was never accepted by me. There was a noticeable change in the faculty attitude after the freshman year, and I feel that attitude should have commenced the

first year in law school. The ability to think through a problem has to be the greatest asset the School gives to its students. In retrospect it was a good experience in my life."

"I am opposed to trade school approach which Burger appears to favor. Too many lawyers know how to do everything but think."

"I did come away from Michigan with the feeling that little attention is paid to the average or better than average law student - those falling just below Law Review or Coif. A mere 'good' student seemed overlooked - even as to job recruiting. I have always felt that had I gone to a local law school - and perhaps been Law Review, I might have fared somewhat better later. However, the 'Michigan' name has been helpful on occasion, and I do think fondly of Michigan."

"There is a more rewarding way to spend one's life than in solving other peoples' problems."

"The Michigan Law School gave a terrific legal education. I question, however, if there couldn't be less dependence on the Socratic method. I think it is too much of a change from undergraduate teaching without an introduction period. Also I would stress pre-law in college for the sole purpose of familiarizing the student with legal terminology. Also accounting is very important."

"I count the most valuable aspect of my legal education to be the experience, particularly in the first year, of the case method of instruction; and I deplore what appear to be current trends against it. The experience of Jack Dawson in person and Edgar Durfee through his casebook, were the intellectual cream of my law school experience, and a greater contribution to my 'liberal arts' education than all my undergraduate years. A different, but equally valuable part of my legal education was extensive research and writing, on the Law Review, in special projects for Eric Stein, and (as an instructor!) in the Problem & Research program. The Moot Court competition also merits favorable mention in this category. I applauded the extension of writing experience beyond the favored few on the Law Review through the Problems & Research program."

"I have managed to maintain a very busy, challenging practice including significant appellate practice, stay married, raise three children who have never been behavior problems, serve as a city commissioner in a small (30,000 pop.) but active community and to take some spendid vacations!"

"I am interested in the results of this survey. I am debating on whether my children should be directed into medicine as a career. I believe the law school should spend more effort in the area of the

practical approach to law, rather than its emphasis on the academic. After all - we all can't be appellate judges or Wall Street lawyers."

"My preference for Michigan is tempered by my recognition of Harvard Law School standing, particularly in the East."

"My law school years and training were a very rewarding experience."

"I am doing what I set out to do - general practice in a small town. I have satisfied my goals financially and feel that I am respected by my fellow practitioners. My children will soon be graduating from high school (3-6 years) and I am sure none of them wishes to be an attorney because as they say it 'they work too hard.' It is very tough being a general practitioner - trying to keep up with it all, spend time with your family and fulfill civic obligations for your community. Blackstone said, 'The law is a jealous mistress.' My wife agrees. I wouldn't have it any different for me, but hope for a different life for my children."

"I believe that my training received at Michigan was exceptional. I am most satisfied with my law school education."

"Michigan policy (at least when I graduated) of revealing graduate class rank hurts initial chances of non-Law Review graduates obtaining positions with law firms. Schools such as Harvard with similar high standards believe each of its graduates is superior when compared to law school graduates nationwide and thus do not rank graduates, so in the eyes of employers they are the same (with the exception of Law Review). In addition, when I graduated the law school placement services existed more for Law Review graduates."

"If it is of any value in your study, I shall indicate that although I believe I have accomplished a level of success and achieved reputation better than others of my contemporaries in the Utah Bar (record of success in several important cases; prestigious clients; reasonably good income for this community; an 'A' rating in Martindale-Hubbell; leading partner in an excellent and well respected firm; appointed by judiciary to important committees, etc.) I do not consider myself really well suited, temperamentally, for the practice of law and I would not choose this career were I starting over. Although a substantial part of my practice is trial-oriented (commercial litigation) I absolutely detest the contention involved in the law. Even without litigation, there is a substantial element of contention involved in the necessarily adversary routine related to most negotiating situations in law - for example, even in preparation of contracts, leases, etc."

"My career has been somewhat unusual in that after 6 years as an associate I left private practice to take a legal position with a corporation. Then, after 6 years with the corporation, I returned



to private practice, a move I found to be without much precedent. I was affiliated with a firm on a semi-independent basis for 2 years and have now become associated with a large firm, much like my first association. Insofar as I can predict the future, this should be my last move."

"Disliked the arrogance of the law school intensely, but greatly enjoy the practice of law."

"My law school education gave me the necessary tools for achieving my present position in society. I feel that the discipline and method of instruction are primarily responsible. I would be very disappointed to learn that these things are being changed for whatever reason, even if to accomplish a substantial social contribution. In my view, the school and its reputation should not be tampered with because of a temporary goal."

"Have had many occasions to be grateful for the high quality of my law school education."

"While I feel that U. of M. Law School prepared me intellectually for practicing law, it did so only for a big city - big firm type practice. For all the good 3 years at U. of M. did me, I might better have 'read law' in my hometown of 20,000-25,000. I'm happy as a lawyer, primarily because of the financial success. But I'm not really sure if I want my children to be lawyers - attend law school, yes - but to practice law, I don't know. It is too difficult today to do a conscientious job for your clients (mostly individuals) and still be a father, husband, member of the community and enjoy life."

"Perhaps the reason none of my professors stand out as contributing to what success I have achieved results from the fact that I am a trial lawyer. Being specialized as I am, I see two very basic deficiencies in young lawyers. First, they are for the most part, initially incapable of writing as an advocate and they write as law journal candidates. Second, few young lawyers know anything about the trial of a law suit. For the most part, they are incompetent and many continue that way for a long time to the detriment of public interest."

"I feel that my education at the University of Michigan Law School was far above what an ordinary law school education would be. The professors were demanding, but the work required was excellent as a prerequisite to high professional standards once graduated. I believe our work load far exceeded the work load of most law school students (other than at the other very fine schools). The high quality of work expected and the approach of the professors tended to make the students really think and analyze, which, to me, was highly important. The Socratic method was valuable during the first year

and a half in order to enable a new student to 'get the feel' for the law, court cases, and the like. However, thereafter, I feel seminar-type of education and more practical planning type of approaches might be more helpful. I recommend an apprenticeship for any graduate law student prior to being formally admitted to practice."

"My most valuable experience was teaching because I first had to learn the subject then graded many papers thereby seeing and judging good from bad. (Perhaps a trial lawyer should first be a judge.) No question that extensive research and extensive writing is valuable. Also teaching if possible. (The reason I taught after law school is because I knew my legal background was inadequate. It was a miserable year at Berkeley, but well worth it in the long run.) Writing compels thinking - clear writing comes from clear thinking. I wish every course after the first year were completely research and writing."

"Quality of teachers paramount. Constant quality review. Third year is a waste. Should be converted to a year of preparation for practice, but not a boondoggle year guided by incompetent recent graduates, but rather a true intern year of bona-fide, realistic training. Top practicing lawyers as faculty. Basic courses should be emphasized in remaining (i.e., first) two years. Cut out esoterica. Some substitute for exams must be explored (what the substitute is, I don't know). Emphasis on exams, and on notetaking, robs study of its spirit."

"I believe the economic incentive to enter into private practice has been reduced in the last few years. The first few years, private practice is generally less rewarding financially than government or corporation employment. In recent years the courts and legislature have been changing the areas of greatest monetary return for an established attorney (i.e., probate, negligence) while calling upon the private attorney to donate more and more of his time to non-paying or low paying services (court appointments, legal aid, etc.). The opportunity for economic reward ultimately, to offset the initial risk, investment and struggle is diminishing."

"My first 12 years were in Public Service, firstly when appointed Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, then elected for 2 4-year terms. Then chose not to run for re-election for reasons which are a story in themselves. I then entered private practice. I therefore entered the law business in midstream of my life with perspective of one who is mature, but a fresh one. My comments: (1) Too many lawyers are being trained for the market! (2) The law profession is becoming more and more a business and less and less a profession, (3) Lawyer's ethics leave much to be desired - witness Watergate. This indicates a great failure on the part of law school. (4) Too many lawyers decline to be involved in public matters."

"There is an overlay between law and accounting profession which should be eliminated. I think taxation should be left to accountants and only tax litigation to lawyers. We should have had a sufficient course in professional responsibility to understand our position, at least in relation to our clients, our responsibility to the bar, fees, and above all, when a conflict of interest is possible and how it may be avoided or resolved. Our course in ethics was brief and not highly regarded by the students."

"My education at Michigan has served me very well indeed. The general courses which drummed in the capability to think logically were the best. Some of my professors, men like Harvey and B.J. George, I disliked intently at the time, but I must reluctantly admit that they taught me law as well or better than most. Michigan could spend more time on legal writing. A lawyer really cannot function unless he can draw documents which express a business deal or write briefs properly. I would not want law school to become a trade school, but I do believe that more time should be spent on legal writing. Almost all of my drafting skill was taught to me by my older partners after law school."

"I feel that law-trainees need more outside practical experience: law office, courts, etc. I received none during my 3 years at Michigan. I don't feel that Case Clubs or Moot Court prepare a young lawyer to even argue a traffic case, let alone a felony. Perhaps the Legal Aid law-trainee program is a start, but an extern-intern program would be more meaningful. To me, this is the biggest weakness in our law schools today - we graduate lawyers who can't draw a deed or a will and who can't begin to try a case."

"I am surprised each year when I go to the law school to recruit at the obvious lack of interest by the school in U.M. graduates. I suggest a faculty official greet attorneys during the day. How about arranging a luncheon for all recruiting lawyers (at their own expense)? Note that U-M can always free up faculty people to raise money."

"I believe there could be much more contact with practicing lawyers than there was when I was in law school. Too much academic, not enough of the touching of life. Good men now in practice, back for 2 or 3 day or week seminars, could be invaluable."

"Years at law school were interesting and challenging - although the actual practice of law *persé* was never considered seriously."

"The Michigan Degree was a significant factor in getting my present position. Other Michigan law graduates I have observed are on the average substantially better lawyers than those from other schools."

"I feel that the quality of legal education at Michigan while I was there was excellent. Its publications and reputation indicates that it has maintained that status. What I read in the 'Quad' and in the Law Review indicate that the school is 'keeping up with the times' in a mature and reasonable way. When I entered law school I had no particular objective other than to obtain a degree. At Michigan I was directed to the practice of law. After fifteen years that direction has proven sound. The law has been a satisfying career. If I were to do it over again, I'd do the same thing."

"For my personal situation, at the time, the University of Michigan was too big, too impersonal. I did not have the maturity to get out of the school the things that others did. My grades suffered and I learned and studied very little. I was very fortunate to scrape through. Even though I was floundering no one helped me. This attitude continued even after graduation, while trying to seek employment. It was only in my senior year that I was starting to develop some maturity. My career since law school has been a continuing success at all levels. I can't thank the University of Michigan Law School."

"There is only one point I would make. I could get no job upon graduation in law or law related areas. The placement office helped not at all, and I had no warning when I started law school that such would be the case. Whereas, I probably have a far more interesting and successful life, painting, writing, and traveling, than most of my classmates; what the society and law school (through non-participation and non-responsibility) did to me in finding me useless was scandalous. I am not likely ever to forget or deny it. However, I know the situation has now changed for other women."

"I believe very strongly that law school should include a year of 'internship' i.e., clinical training in various aspects of law practice. The biggest lack in law school was a sense of the law's practicality, not in some narrow trade sense, but in the problem solving sense, which, after all, is what being a lawyer is all about. The attraction of the law is the call upon intelligence, knowledge, character, and understanding to solve practical problems. To help remedy the lack, it would probably be quite helpful to have practicing lawyers as part of the faculty. This would also serve to help students better prepare for the type of law they wish to practice. (It still remains unbelievable to me that while I was in law school, none of us ever set foot in a court, or ever interviewed, or helped to interview a client.) Courses in conflict resolution and psychology of the same would also be very helpful. Lawyers, after all, spend a great deal of their effort in resolving conflict, and there are skills and approaches that can be taught on this subject. Finally, law students should graduate with a better idea of what their role in society is. Aside from earning a living, what do lawyers contribute? How does society benefit from lawyers?"

"Many law students, self-included, have virtually no knowledge of how commercial transactions, real property sales, secured loans, etc. are consummated. Some lectures on this at the inception of courses such as corporations, securities, sales, etc. would enhance comprehension. E.g., securities cases of an esoteric sort would make more sense if one knew how borrowers get in a bind and think creatively to find acceptable security for the lender and then try to weasel-out when the time comes to pay the piper. Upon further reflection, I think that probably the most crucial courses to successful law practice are property and contracts. Without a good understanding of those topics the rest is just window-dressing."

"My emotions are mixed. Many other law school have lower standards and yet produce lawyers of excellent ability. I am concerned that the University of Michigan Law School has become increasingly oriented toward producing Supreme Court Justices and not practicing lawyers. I do not want to see any change in high standards of excellence; but if I want my sons to actually practice law, I'm not at all certain that the U. of M. Law School is the best place for them to attain that training or orientation. If I want them to study law only then there is no question mark." [about attending Michigan Law School]

"As do many educators, I believe that a small faculty-student ratio is important for improving the quality of legal education. A school like Michigan is too large to provide the type of contacts required."

"I think that future questionnaires should include under XVII C [undergraduate activities] a category for music and non-varsity athletics. I think that future questionnaires should include under XIV C [activities since graduation accounting for 6 months or more, full time, other than ones job] a category for family responsibilities. Some adjustment needs to be made in future questionnaires regarding XIX [income]. In my own case, I worked as a lawyer the first 5 years after graduation. I did not work professionally full time during the next five years, and I have worked full time as a lawyer the past 5 years. Obviously, this makes for misleading averages under XIX if it is assumed that one was working professionally throughout the 15 year period."

"In reference to the law school curriculum, I believe that more attention should be devoted to techniques of 'problem solving' and less attention directed towards formal, rigid predetermined answers. Unfortunately most of my time as a practicing lawyer is devoted to avoiding the harsh results of the routine application of the law by lawyers and judges. Further, the design of the law is to preserve

social oppression and operative law pursues this same direction. The educational system follows in step by supporting a rigid adherence to the status quo relegating those who use and apply the law to social followers who are more often victimizing society rather than contributing to greater harmony and fairness."

"Throw out all the Mickey Mouse courses and make them [students] read cases for two years. Third year, no grades. Trial practice courses, evidence, ethics, and philosophy. Throughout my practice, I have always felt well prepared to be a lawyer as the result of my education at the U. of M. Law School. Throw away the horn books - ban them from the library - destroy the outlines, and get the students back to reading 10 tough cases per day, at least."

"Upon reflection, I am of the opinion that the course offerings and the required courses within the curricula at the law school are exactly what they should be. I believe the frequently heard comment that, 'There should be more practical courses given in law school,' is without merit."

\*\*\*\*\*

The law school is most grateful to all those members of the Class of '59 who took the time to fill in and return the questionnaire. The school will appreciate hearing from anyone who can supply the addresses of Bayard R. Brick, Jr., Frank West Harrah, Louise Milligan, and Lawrence R. Winters, Jr. It is with regret that the school reports that the following members of the Class of '59 are deceased: Alan Robert Lyness, David Whitney Johnson, David Neff Ong, and Ira H. Stavitsky.